Scott, Il.37—45,000—9-1

Development **(1935) Department.**

MS. SERIES.

G.O. No. 814

DATED 10-6-1935

[Despatch Abstract.]

Fisheries —

Fish curing yards — Hosabettu yard — temporary retention — Sanctioned.

Dm. 8414

(O.-m. No 3251) 24.4.)

Belgium. Fish curing yard. Temporary retention - Period of

It is observed that no specific period has been fixed for the temporary continuance of the Hoskalia yard and its staff. The Dir. of Fisheries is requested to submit proposals, very urgently, for fixing the period of retention without of the temporary yard with reasons for this proposals.

To Director of Fisheries

S.O. 16.11.33.

Ldn 17.10

Secy 17/10/33

18/4

Dev. 1641-II
10.5.35.

C.F. 30.

FISHERIES **DEPARTMENT.**

Received ..... 19 *Registered* 19

Subject.

Fish curing yards - Hosabettu - retention - proposals -

Enclosures.
No. .....
.....
Spare copies .....

Ref. No. 892 F/35-3

Station Madras, *Dated the* 9th May 1935.

From (Name) Dr. B. Sundara Raj, M.A., Ph.D.,

(Designation) Director of Fisheries,

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

DEVELOPMENT Department.

Sir,

Ref: Government Memorandum No. 325 II/35-2 dated 24th April 1935.

With reference to Government Memorandum No. 325 II/35-2 Development dated 24th April 1935, I have the honour to submit proposals for the continuance of the Hosabettu fish curing yard. In G.O.No. 1610 Miscellaneous Development dated 6th November 1931 the Government sanctioned the re-opening of the yard on two conditions that the curers agreed to make good the loss in working it and that they made an advance deposit of Rs. 450/- On the curers fulfilling these conditions the yard was re-opened on 8th December 1931 with a staf

of 2 peons only. The peon in charge was replaced by a petty yard officer with effect from 1st January 1935 in accordance with the orders in G.O.No. 1064 Miscellaneous Development dated 25th July 1934.

2. The Assistant Director of Fisheries (Coast) reports that the yard worked at a profit of Rs. 10-12-1, Rs. 135-7-8 and Rs. 172-14-2 during the periods 8th December 1931 to 7th December 1932, 8th December 1932 to 7th December 1933 and 8th December 1933 to 7th December 1934 respectively. The yard has not so far shown any loss since its re-opening on 8th December 1931.

3. The yard caters to the needs of a poor community of actual fishermen as opposed to capitalists. The curers are anxious to have the yard in their midst and have deposited Rs. 450/- as security against loss and have undertaken to execute a bond making themselves liable to reimburse loss in working the yard. Moreover, the yard has shown decided improvement since its re-opening as will be seen from the figures of consumption of salt given below:--

Period.	Quantity of salt consumed:
1-7-1929 to 30-6-1930	320 Mds. 18 seers.
1-7-1930 to 30-6-1931	335 " 30 "
1-7-1931 to 30-6-1932	373 " 30 "(The yard stood closed temporarily from 1-10-31 to 8-12-31 in the busiest part of the season)
1-7-1932 to 30-6-1933	839 Mds. 18 seers.
1-7-1933 to 30-6-1934	603 " 26 "
1-7-1934 to 31-12-1934	968 " 10 (6 months)

4. In the circumstances, I recommend that the yard may be retained permanently. Should a further period of trial is considered by Government necessary, three years from 1st April 1935 with the staff of 1 petty yard officer and 1 peon may be fixed as the specific period. Necessary provision for the yard has been included in the current year's budget.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

for Director of Fisheries.
9.5.35.

9/5

Extract of note from file re: Temporary posts. Fisheries Dept. - Special rules.

Proposals for the temporary retention of the Puthiakadapuram, Baikambadi, and Nattika yards have been received from the Director and the draft orders in each case has been sent to the Finance Dept. for acceptance. The period of sanction in the draft orders has been tentatively adopted in the statement. Information is not available as regards the Hosabettu yard. The Director may be asked. A draft T.M. is submitted.

D.R.
14-3-35.

V.S.M.
14/3.

Issue.
R.R.
15-3-35.

T. M. to the Director of Fisheries, dated 15-3-35.

Ref: Your letter D.Dis.No.3120/G/34, dated 21-1-35 - Public Services - Temporary posts - Special rules.

Please state the period of sanction in respect of the temporary petty yard officer employed in the Hosubettu fish curing yard.

***

Reply dated 6-4-1935.

---

(1) In G.O.No.Mis.725 Dev., dated 16-4-1929 the Govt. directed that the fish curing yard at Hosabettu with the staff of 3 peons be retained throughout the year for a period of three years from 15-3-1929. Before this sanction expired the yard was temporarily closed as a measure of

(2) retrenchment on 1-10-1931. In G.O.No.1610 Mis., Dev. dated 6-11-1931 the Govt. sanctioned the re-opening of the yard without specifying any limit of time on two conditions, that the curers agreed to make good the loss and that they made an advance deposit of Rs.450/-. On the curers

fulfilling these conditions the yard was re-opened with a staff of two peons. In accordance with orders in G.O.No.1046 Mis.Dev. dated 25-7-1934 the peon-in-charge of the yard was replaced by a petty yard officer with effect from 1-1-1935.

D

***

To U.S.

Please see the Director's T.M. reply ~~at page supra~~ above. No period of sanction has been fixed for the petty yard officer in the Hosabuttu fish curing yard. But provision has been made for him in the B.E. for 1935-36. The period of sanction may therefore be fixed as one year from 1-4-35 to 1-4-36. The Director of Fisheries may be asked to submit proposals separately for fixing the period of sanction for the continuance of the Hosabettu yard and its staff. A draft O.M. is submitted.

D.R.
16-4-35.

V.S.M.
17-4-35.

M.K.
17-4-35.

C.A.H.
18-4-35.

[Issued O.M. No. 325-C/35-2 dt 24.4.35] p 1 Cr.
[Dir of Fisheries Rep No 892-F/35-3 pp 2-3 Cr.
dated 9.5.35]

To Underlining

Please see the Director's letter at pages 2-3 Cr. The question of permanent retention of the Hosabettu yard may be referred for the present. In the circumstances explained by the Director, the yard may perhaps be temporarily continued with a staff of 1 petty yard officer and 1 peon for a further period

A

Finance (E.T.).

The fish curing yard at Hosabettu was closed temporarily as a measure of retrenchment on 1-10-31. In G.O.1610 Dev., dated 6-11-31, sanction was accorded to the reopening of the yard subject to certain conditions, but the period of sanction was not specified in the order. The Dev. Dept. now propose that the yard may be continued with a staff of one yard officer and one peon for a period of 3 years from 1-4-35.

It is submitted that the amount of security to be demanded from curers has to be determined with reference to the results of the working of the yard in the previous financial year. It does not seem desirable to sanction the continuance of the yard for more than a year on the basis of the present security of Rs.450 fixed with reference to the results of the working in 1930-31. Though the yard has worked at a profit during the last three years, there is no guarantee that it will continue to work at a profit in future.

In the circumstances, Finance may advise that the continuance of the yard may for the present be sanctioned for a year from 1-4-35 (instead of for 3 years as proposed by Dev.) - cf. G.O.483 Dev., dated 25th March 1935 in which the opening

of a yard at Moolky in S.Kanara Dt. was sanctioned only for a year.

29.5.35.

Rec 30/5/35

D 1853 11/35
1-6-35

29/5/35

Rec

Fen. 222 Est. 35.1
30.5.35

Fin. Secy.

To Under Secy

UNDER SECRETARY TO GOVT. 31 MAY 1935 DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Please see the remarks of the Finance Secy. above. Their Secy. advises that the continuance of the yard may be sanctioned for one year from 1.4.35. for orders whether this may be agreed to. If so, the usual order below is for approval

D.O.
6.6.35.

In view of the satisfactory working of the yard and the profits shown against it by the Divl. at page 3 c/f. and considering that the existence of a yard is desirable from the point of view of public health, the security of Rs. 450/- appears sufficient for three years unless, by way of super-abundant caution it is necessary to restrict the continuance for only a year. In fact if security for three years were to be worked out, the figures would perhaps make a reduced security sufficient.

Sec. S.
6/6/35.

E/ 8

The position can be considered again at the end of the year - But the anticipation of loss seems unduly pessimistic

JA 5/6

Shown in 6/1435

with H.M. 3

6/6

JA 5/6

9

DRAFT FOR APPROVAL. 6/10/6 O.F.16.

	Date.	Initia's.
When received for fair copying ..		
When copied ..	10/6	
When examined..		
When signed ..		
When despatched.		

SUBJECT:— Dun. Dept.

Fisheries - Fish curing yards. Hosaletta yard - temporary retention - Sanction

READ AGAIN Govt 1610 Dy, dated 6. 11. 1931

" " " 19

READ *ALSO*:—

No. 3251/35 From the Dir of Fisheries, No. 3251/35-1, dated 2nd 4 1935

" " From do Dept. 892F/35:5 9.5. 1935

" " " " 19

Order / ~~Resolution~~ Ms. / ~~Rout.~~ No. 814, dated 10-6-35 19

Govt Dun/3CF

Govt Dun/3 NF.

Govt. 1022 Dun 13.7.34 (E)

The Govt Sanction the temporary retention of the Hosaletta fish curing yard with a staff of one petty yard officer and one peon for a further period of one year from 1st April 1935, subject to the conditions that the Owners concerned undertake to reimburse to Govt the loss, if any, incurred in the working of the yard and to execute a bond making themselves jointly and severally liable

6 2

to make good the loss

AA 5/6

To

The Dir of Archives

- Arch. Council through the Foreign Office

copy to the Foreign Office

D.O. 4.6.35

Despd. 11-6-35